



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

1920 ed., p. 40-41, was alluded to as in general a good plan for township libraries. The Okmulgee library shows this plan modified for a larger building.

Mr. Hadley of Denver spoke of the desirability of having the delivery desk near the rear of the building with working space for the library staff, and yet also having the desk not too far from the front entrance; hence a building should not be too deep. He

would have the working space behind the desk shut off by partitions the same height as the desk.

It was voted that Mr. Stetson be chairman of a committee to arrange for a round table at the next meeting.

Helen Sperry, of Waterbury, Conn., acted as secretary of the round table.

W. K. STETSON,
Chairman.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING SECTION

The chairman and secretary were absent. The following paper by Ethel Sawyer of the Portland Library Association was read by Anne M. Mulheron.

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN LIBRARY SCHOOL AND TRAINING CLASS INSTRUCTION

By ETHEL R. SAWYER, *Director, Training Class, Portland, Oregon*

At the very outset I would wish it to be understood that any plain speaking in which this paper may indulge is the result of no upstart criticism of our library schools. Those eleven young Atlases on whose harassed shoulders the weight of the entire library profession has come to rest, merit our entire sympathy in a most difficult situation. To borrow another ancient metaphor, librarians in active service are asking the schools to exhibit the dexterity of institutional Colossi and to stand firmly erect, with one foot supported by the raw and utterly inexperienced elementary student of library affairs, while the other foot must rest upon the experienced librarian who wants the professional polish and the highly specialized instruction of the graduate school. The resulting angle is neither graceful nor secure; and my vision shows me only two possible ways out of this difficult situation. Either fit the legs to the required attitude or stop trying to be a Colossus.

To speak plainly, I see no firm foundation for our schools unless they can equip themselves to deal with their students in accordance with their needs and qualifications, differentiating between the experienced

worker and the recruit; between the undergraduate's general course and the preparation for a doctor's degree—or its library equivalent. Or, they must frankly turn over to other agencies the elementary training in library technique and devote themselves to truly professional education.

Everyone has among her circle of friends at least one disappointed student, who, after years of practical work in a library, went to library school and there spent valuable hours in learning to do in class or in practice time what she had actually been receiving several years' salary for doing just as effectively. She had to mark time while a girl who had never been in a library until her initial library practice struggled with such elementary terms as shelf-list and corporate entry, and mastered the fact that Smith, J. M., files before Smith, James. It is true that later on some one else may have had to mark time while she filled up a lacuna in her experimental knowledge. But how do these two wrongs make one right? One year is too short a time to allow for much time-marking in the mastery of so vitally taxing a subject as librarianship.

Also one year is much too short a time in which to teach both technique and those literary, social, and professional matters which are supposed to distinguish a librarian from a library clerk. What becomes then of all the study of books and people, their reactions one on the other, the peculiar problems which devolve upon the librarian in this age, the enthusiastic and intelligent orientation of the librarian to his community, the clear visioning of the possibilities and the responsibilities of librarianship;—well, look at any li-

library school curriculum and see what bare bones we are compelled to substitute for all this needed substance, and how pitifully few even these bones are. No one will agree with me more heartily, I am sure, than the library school instructors here present.

The fact being admitted, what is the remedy? There are several remedial possibilities which suggest themselves, and one is contained in the title of this paper: the proper correlation of library school and training class instruction. There are at present six (?) training classes in the country, giving definitely organized elementary library training varying in time from six to nine months, and fitting their students to hold certain positions in their respective libraries higher than mere clerkships. In the Portland Library, graduates from the training class go into general assistant's positions at a salary slightly lower than that of a library school graduate; but everything up to first assistantships is open to them. Our graduates have been accepted on equal terms by the Seattle Library and throughout the state of Oregon assistantships and, in the smaller libraries, even librarianships have been offered to them, although only necessity compels us reluctantly to accept the latter. The University of Washington has accepted graduation from our class as an equivalent for a certain number of credits towards its library school course. And yet no other library school, so far as I know, would excuse a student of ours from elementary technical courses. I do not mean to say that a girl going from the Portland training class to a library school might not, by judicious representation and after qualifying in some way, be released from certain glaring repetitions of courses; but, in general, her training class year would count for very little except in enabling her to make a better school record. And why should it? What does the course of the Portland training class mean to any library school? It may be very good, and again it may be very bad. Who knows?

Now the first correlation needed between library schools and training classes lies just here. Somebody should know! Let the training classes make the library schools acquainted with their work and let the library

schools agree on some evaluation of the various training classes so that a student of any training class may know just where in any library school curriculum she can begin. The library schools could also tell the training classes just what portions of elementary library technique, for instance, they would be willing to have taught in training classes and to give credit for in their courses. Such an arrangement would work beneficially in at least two directions. It would release some of the energies of library school instructors for more advanced teaching, and it would furnish an incentive to training classes to maintain a standard of excellence acceptable to the library schools. Even more important to the training classes, it would insure official recognition to their students for work done.

This plan would fit in with the suggestion made by the library workers that the library schools' summer courses be so arranged as to allow of definite credits being earned towards a complete library school course. Such an arrangement would undoubtedly help the training classes to recruit more desirable students for their classes. Students who are unable to go to library school immediately, often turn away from library work altogether because their training class year would get them nowhere that they can see up the professional ladder. Their very ambition turns them from us to some better organized profession where their activities will count toward definite advancement.

This correlation of substance brings out another correlation which should be made between library schools and training classes, and that is in the matter of methods of instruction. I cannot see why a method of teaching certain technical subjects cannot be decided upon by experienced teachers and a sort of manual prepared which should be used as a text-book by all training class and elementary library school classes at least. A manual of teaching elementary cataloging, for instance—not cataloging for any particular library but the general principles underlying all cataloging. We do not teach algebra according to the algebra used in the New York public schools or the schools of California. We teach algebra—the fundamental principles, which we can use either in New

York or in California. In California they may want more advanced algebra, but that comes later. Here it seems to me an inexcusable amount of time and energy is wasted throughout the profession. Surely we have passed beyond the period of experimentation in certain technical matters and, preserving sufficient flexibility to meet varying conditions, we could agree upon the formulation of certain best practices for typical conditions. Or is the amount of imprint to be put on a catalog card so abstruse and esoteric a matter that each school and each acting cataloger must through tears and tribulation win to the ideal heaven of the perfect catalog card! I can conceive of a cataloging course which should be concerned chiefly with teaching its students how to use the various tools of cataloging, what sorts of cards should be made for what sorts of libraries, how to vary the normal card to meet various peculiar demands of your public, the difference between fundamentals and the variabilities in cataloging, and such matters as should make our students quick at adaptability rather than grounded in formality. The student of carpentry may not make a perfect kitchen cabinet at first, but he knows the use of all his tools, and doesn't use a plane where a jack-knife would produce better results. Sometimes I think we try to train librarians to make perfect kitchen cabinets at once before we have let them become familiar with their tools. To my mind the training classes can admirably serve to acquaint prospective students with the simpler library tools leaving the fine scroll-work and the high polish and the complexities and refinements of the profession to the library schools.

And here we must bring into play our powers of organization. It is a well-known psychological fact that certain habits of thinking, certain informational matters can be best assimilated by the student by permitting only the *desired* impressions to come into the brain at first. Every false impression not only excludes the correct one but has actually to be overcome before the correct one can find lodgment. "No false starts" should be the educational motto here. Expedition is demanded in conveying to the student certain rules and facts and such rules

and facts could be standardized and put into permanent concise form for distribution and for future reference at need. Yes, of course, I know there are the *A.L.A. catalog rules* and Kroeger's *Guide to reference books*. But these invaluable tools were not prepared exactly with the needs of the elementary library courses in mind—indeed I doubt whether they were designed primarily for pedagogical use. They are tools of the trade rather than text-books.

Now that is exactly what I mean! We must go at our library teaching pedagogically. Why should we neglect all that other educational experts have discovered and placed ready to our hand? For after all we are, or should be, primarily teachers, we library school and training class specialists in the library schools; teachers, and as special as we *can* be, in the training classes. We must know *how* to teach—methods and psychology—as well as *what* we are teaching. And that means, or should mean, a definite organization for educational work within our profession—with the library schools at the head, and the training classes, summer classes, apprentice classes and eventually perhaps extension classes and correspondence classes—though these latter would be a difficult problem to meet. The little old red school house days of library education are over and we've got to function along with state universities and professional colleges.

You will perhaps observe that I am not making the customary distinction between the field of library school and training class instruction, namely, that a library school gives a study of comparative library methods and a training class instructs only in the methods of one library. It is true that a library school should give a wider survey of the entire field of library procedure, but I find that it is not necessary to restrict the training class student's vision to so narrow a field. In fact comparison of her library's methods with those of other libraries makes for a more intelligent administration of local practices. I prefer to correlate the library school and the training class as elementary library instruction and advanced education. There has sprung up a third division in library training agencies owing to the development of instruc-

tion in certain of the larger training classes, and that is the apprentice class proper. I think the distinction should be clearly drawn here between apprentice classes and training classes. The former group *now* is the training group whose interests are entirely local, and their training period rarely outruns three or four months. From the ranks of the apprentices should come our clerks and clerical attendants who are not eligible for real professional library services without further training.

Every once in awhile I have the uncomfortable feeling that we librarians are engaged in that futile occupation of trying to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps. We urge more training and education in our members, we cry for recruits to librarianship, we deplore the possibility of the library clerk usurping the functions of true professional service—but we very slowly and inadequately prepare facilities for the cultivation of that higher type of librarianship and the obtaining of advanced professional equipment. Discouragement and slackened fibre attend upon disappointed ambition. I would not, for more than I can say, appear before you in the guise of a pessimistic gloom-bringer, but I do see many indications of discouragement among librarians—many of them are some of the sincerest members of our profession. I believe that never before has library work had such an opportunity for development; but we shall have to bend every energy intelligently to the task of grasping that opportunity.

The library schools *with their present equipment* cannot do more than they are doing. But it is just possible that with the co-operation of the training classes they might decide to do slightly *different* things, and things more in accord with their high professional status. I believe dissatisfaction or discouragement with requirements for admission does not operate so disastrously as dissatisfaction with opportunities after admission, and the results to the profession are incomparably preferable in the former case. At one end or the other the pressure must be as severe and it seems to me that in the library schools the anguish must come at the lower end. Good training classes established

and recognized throughout the country would shortly serve as preparatory schools and trying-out laboratories for the library schools, turning over to them an ever improving grade of students fit for professional work.

I said above "*with their present equipment.*" Of course the present equipment of most library schools is ridiculously inadequate. Propose to any other technical or professional school a budget of \$10,000-15,000 a year for total administration and note the pitying smile you will receive. And yet how many of our library schools are financing themselves on an even smaller budget! Now it is a truism of life that you cannot get something for nothing. Someone must pay. And it has usually been the school faculty out of whose over-worked blood and nerves the deficit has been wrung, or the student body, who have not received the quality of instruction or the breadth of training to which they were entitled. Professionalism cannot indefinitely thrive on a permanent budgetary deficit. Library school appropriations should be considerably increased to enable specialists and educators to be retained on their faculties, and to lift library education on to a plane with other specialized training. So long as value is directly associated with the salary status it is not fitting that library school instructors should rank with the stenographers of an institution; neither is it probable that desirable teachers, except those few individuals who can afford to be so noble, will be found willing to undertake the taxing duties of teaching at a salary less than that of librarians in comparatively recent service.

This is not a paper on library school budgets—fortunately. So I am not obliged to do more than exhort in general terms. However, if this *were* such a paper, I think I should elaborate on the text "Ask and ye shall receive." I realize that "the petitioned" in the text was not a board of city or county fathers or anything of that ilk, but I like to believe that most of those old texts that are any good at all have rather a wide general applicability even to seemingly most irrelevant cases. And the outcome is so definitely stated as a result of the asking, that sometimes I wonder whether the library's no-

toriously small responses to financial prayers may not be due to faulty petitioning. I believe "to ask" is an *active* verb, *definite*, in the *imperative* mode, and we are so inclined to passive, indefinite hortatoriness—are we not?

While we are waiting for an answer to prayer, however, we might find partial relief for our financial stringency in a large use of co-operation. Would it not be feasible to supplement the regular courses in our schools with some sort of peripatetic lectureships, drawing on the resources of the entire country just as now all library schools draw for outside lectures on distinguished librarians in the vicinity?

Of course the obvious objection to that is the expense of such lecturers and their traveling schedules. There are desirable times for such irruptions into the orderly class routine—and less desirable times. Adjustments would have to be made. I refuse to believe however that a profession which has evolved the modern American library system—one of the most successful co-operative service organizations in existence today—cannot find a way to achieve co-operative educational aims of at least as national a character as education in general has achieved. If not by this plan then why not try "exchange professorships" of three, or six, or nine months, which would assist in the circulation of library ideas throughout the profession?

The important point is that we shall go at this whole matter of library education from a national standpoint, deciding upon what *should* constitute professional education—in 1922 as distinct from 1890—what part of that education the library schools must give and what should be delegated to pre-professional or elementary training classes. Perhaps the profession as a whole would be most benefited by the encouragement of training classes widely scattered throughout the country giving three or six or nine months' courses planned and accredited by the A.L.A. Professional Training Section, with the definite purpose of preparing suitable students for library schools later. Whatever the plan it should be something that has the entire library profession behind it, not a mere matter of the handful of library schools and

training classes. It is the most vital matter before the library body today and demands the attention of everyone, just as the whole question of education is today demanding large national planning backed by the intelligent co-operation of the entire nation.

Discussion: Miss Donnelly asked if Miss Sawyer meant to exclude all but training school people. Answer: No, the intention was merely to make some allowance for difference between the absolutely untrained and the partially trained.

Miss Donnelly thought some allowances possible in individual cases, but not for a whole group—the difficulties of administration being too great. Experience has been that advanced students find it no waste of time. The person who knows the most gets most out of the most elementary lecture. Miss Donnelly advises students not to take training class work but to acquire all the academic work possible and finish with library school.

The question was asked whether it were possible to give any credit to training class students and so shorten the time of library school. It was thought possible only if the library school could afford to run two sections, but not feasible unless library school classes are much larger.

Lura Hutchinson asked if it would be feasible for one or two schools to specialize in advanced work and allow credit for training class work.

Miss Tyler asked if there were not more than six training classes and suggested that if there were so few, it would be possible for these training classes to get together and standardize courses and present some united project to library schools. She thought that at present it would be difficult to give credit to the training class students.

Miss Donnelly thought it would be necessary to establish standards of admission to classes. Certain schools could be placed on the accredited list and kept there as long as students keep up to grade. The library schools would welcome elimination of some of the preparatory work. If training classes could formulate the equivalent to entrance courses, correlation would be possible.

Mr. Henry also thought correlation might

be possible if training classes would submit courses. He made a plea for the academic background, preferring an academic education and elementary library training to less education and more special training.

The chairman of the A.L.A. Committee on Library Training made no report.

The following officers were elected for the coming year:

Elva L. Bascom, University of Texas Library School, chairman.

Marie Newberry, Toledo Public Library, vice-chairman.

Blanche Watts, Iowa Summer School, secretary.

L. L. MORGAN,
Vice-Chairman.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS ROUND TABLE

First Session

Eighty librarians were present at the first meeting of the Public Documents Round Table held on June 27, with H. H. B. Meyer presiding.

A brief statement was submitted on

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POPULAR USE OF DOCUMENTS

BY JESSIE M. WOODFORD, *Chicago Public Library*

A year ago this committee was authorized to continue its work and bring to a practical finish the documents survey reported at the Documents Round Table of last year, by the preparation of a *Handbook on the popular use of documents*, the material for which had largely been supplied by the replies to the questionnaire.

It is a pleasure to report this work as under way, after the usual delays, although not as far advanced as the committee hoped it would be. The *Handbook* has been outlined and submitted for criticism to the chairman of the Documents Committee, and to the co-members of the sub-committee. Through Mr. Meyer it was also submitted to the Editorial Committee of the A. L. A. at the mid-winter conference. The Editorial Committee took no formal action, as hardly enough progress had been made to warrant it, but through Mr. Milam assured the sub-committee of its interest, the secretary adding the hope that the manuscript would be soon ready for consideration.

The plan is for a small, hundred-page, bound handbook, divided into nine chapters and illustrated with a few necessary views of methods. The committee's aim is to provide

a clear, simple outline of successful and practical methods for carrying on popular work with documents—something that will meet the existing need of the smaller as well as the larger libraries, culling from the mass of material which the survey on the popular use of documents has provided.

The chapter headings are as follows: Documents in libraries; How to obtain documents; Classification; Cataloging; Arrangement and care of documents; Preparation for circulation; Publicity methods; Assistants for document work; Documents for popular use.

It may be inferred from the chapter titles that the plans of the committee duplicate Mr. Wyer's justly famous pamphlets: *U. S. government documents in small libraries*, and *Government documents (state and city)*, which he is revising and which will shortly be issued in one pamphlet, but the aim of the committee is to treat the matter from an entirely different point of view, and to avoid all unnecessary duplication by consulting Mr. Wyer's helpful work.

Your criticism and suggestions are most earnestly requested, and your chairman will welcome such, for if the *Handbook* is to be the guide we hope it will be, it must not only be accurate and thoroughly practical, but have the spirit which underlies dynamic force,—the power to serve.

Respectfully submitted,

JESSIE M. WOODFORD, Chairman,
EDITH GUERRIER,
EMMA HANCE,
ALTHEA WARREN,

Sub-Committee on Popular Use of Documents.

Then followed an address on